**Remarks:**

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 23 and 24 are presently pending in the application. Claims 13 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1 - 12 were previously canceled. Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 25 have been canceled, herein.

In item 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 13 - 15, 18 - 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,434,524 to Weber ("**WEBER**") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,678,039 to Hinks et al ("**HINKS**"), and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,834,276 to Jenson et al ("**JENSON**"). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 16, 17, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **WEBER** in view of **HINKS** and **JENSON**, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,708,164 to Cseri et al ("**CSERI**").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, as applied to the amended claims.

More particularly, Applicant has amended claim 13 to include the limitations previously recited in Applicant's former claims 14 and 15, among other limitations. Similarly,

Applicant has amended claim 20 to include the limitations previously recited in Applicant's former claims 21 and 22, among other limitations. Applicant's amended claim 13 now recites, among other limitations:

> checking each dialog element of a user interface of the computer program to determine whether a character string present in the respective dialog element includes **a wildcard character string starting with a characteristic prefix followed by a name descriptor;**
>
> **finding in the text memory identification expressions associated with the wildcard character string** contained in the computer program **by evaluating a path for the wildcard character string, the path being formed using at least the name descriptor of the wildcard character string;** [emphasis added by Applicant]

Similarly, Applicant's amended claim 20 now recites, among other limitations:

> means for checking each dialog element of a user interface of the computer program to determine whether a character string present in the respective dialog element includes **a wildcard character string starting with a characteristic prefix followed by a name descriptor;**
>
> **means for finding identification expressions in said text memory associated with said wildcard character string** contained in the computer program **by evaluating a path for the wildcard character string, the path being formed using at least the name descriptor of said wildcard character string;** [emphasis added by Applicant]

The amendments to claims 13 and 20 are supported by the specification of the instant application, for example, by page 9 of the instant application, lines 7 – 29, which state:

> In this example, these character strings are in the form of **wildcard character strings which start with a characteristic prefix, for example two successive paragraph characters**. In this way, wildcard character strings can easily be distinguished from dialog texts, which are not wildcard character strings, in the subsequent method.
>
> **For the rest, the wildcard character strings are constructed from name descriptors in the form of XML tag names**, in the present case "SICAMPAS", "ConfigurationTool" and "HelloWorld", for example, in text field one, and "SICAMPAS", "Common" and "OK", for example, in the first button 2. These are separated from one another by oblique strokes. This produces a path comprising XML tags or name descriptors, which allow the nested name descriptors to be resolved in the subsequent method, or allow the desired entry to be found in an XML table.
>
> **Accordingly, the text character strings for the buttons 2 and 3 are constructed from a characteristic prefix, XML tags as name descriptors and separating oblique strokes to produce wildcard character strings which, minus the characteristic prefix, produce an XML path**. [emphasis added by Applicant]

As such, each of Applicant's claims currently requires, among other things, a wildcard character string including a characteristic prefix **followed by a name descriptor**, wherein identification expressions associated with the wildcard character string in the computer program are found, in the text memory, **by evaluating a path formed using at least the name descriptor of the wildcard character string**.

The prior art fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations, finding an identification expression associated in a text memory with a wildcard character string in the

computer program, **by evaluating a path formed from a name descriptor of the wildcard character string**, as required by Applicant's claims.

Applicant's former claim 15, now canceled, recited, among other things, a path formed from at least one of the previously recited name descriptors. With regard to Applicant's former claim 15, page 8 of the Office Action stated, in part:

> Re claims 15 and 22, Weber teaches the method according to claim 14, wherein an identification expression in the text memory is found for a wildcard character string (Col. 9 lines 42-63 & Fig.2) by evaluating a path (Col. 16 lines 4-30) for the wildcard character string, and wherein the path is formed from at least one of the name descriptors (Col. 7 lines 14-30).

However, **nothing** in the portions of **WEBER** cited in the Office Action against Applicant's former claim 15, teaches or suggests, among other limitations of Applicant's amended claims, a wildcard character string containing a characteristic prefix followed by a name descriptor, wherein the name descriptor portion of the wildcard character string forms the path for finding the associated identification expression in the text memory, as required by Applicant's claims. For example, Col. 9 of **WEBER**, lines 42 - 63, cited to in the Office Action, state:

> The flow continues to block 330 **where certain "word-variables" are replaced with an associated wildcard function** by variable replacer 204 in preparation for accessing the NLP database 218. As used herein, the term "word-variables" refers to words or phrases that represent amounts, dates, times, currencies, and the like. For example, in one embodiment the phrase "what movies are playing at 8 o'clock" would be transformed at block 330 to "what movies are playing at $time" **where "$time" is a wildcard function used to represent any time value.** As another example, in one embodiment the phrase "sell IBM stock at 100 dollars" would be transformed at block 330 to "sell IBM stock at $dollars" **where "$dollars" is a wildcard function used to represent any dollar value.** This act may be accomplished by a simple loop that searches the phrase for key tokens such as the words "dollar" or "o'clock" and replaces the word-variables with a specified wildcard function. In order to keep track of the location in the phrase where the substitution was made, an array memory be used. This allows re-substitution of the original word-variable back ubti the phrase at the some position after the NLP database 218 has been searched. [emphasis added by Applicant]

However, **nothing** in **WEBER** teaches or suggests, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, **using a name descriptor portion of the wildcard function** (i.e., in **WEBER**, "$time" or "$dollars") **as a path for finding the associated respective message character string in the text memory**, as required by Applicant's claims. In other words, **WEBER** does not teach or suggest, among other things, that the "time" portion of the "$time" wildcard function is used as the **path** for finding a respectively associated character string in the text memory. The **HINKS**, **JENSON** and **CSERI** references, cited in the Office Action in combination with **WEBER** against certain of Applicant's former claims, does not cure the above-discussed

deficiencies of **WEBER**. None of the prior art references teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, finding a message character string associated with a particular wildcard character string in a text memory **using a path formed by a name descriptor portion of the particular wildcard character string**, as required by Applicant's claims.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, Applicant's claims are believed to be patentable over the **WEBER**, **HINKS**, **JENSON** and **CSERI** references, whether taken alone, or in combination.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 13 and 20. Claims 13 and 20 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 13 or 20.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 23 and 24 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

The instant Amendment is being filed simultaneously with a Request for Continued Examination and its associated fee. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any additional fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kerry Pauline Sisselman/
Kerry Pauline Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237

For Applicant

November 24, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101